



April 21, 2002

To: Members, Staff Work Group on Urban Water Use Measurement
From: Eric Poncelet and Bennett Brooks, CONCUR
Re: Key Outcomes: April 7, 2003 Staff Work Group Meeting

Thank you for participating in the Urban Water Use Measurement Staff Work Group meeting held April 7, 2003 in Sacramento. Below please find a brief summary of key outcomes from the meeting.

I. Participants

The following Urban Water Use Measurement Work Group members attended the April 7, 2003 meeting:

Tim Treloar, CA Water Service Co.-Bakersfield	Joe Lima, Modesto Irrigation District
Luis Generoso, San Diego Water Department	Mary Ann Dickinson, CUWCC
David Todd, DWR	Dick Bennett, EBMUD
Lucille Billingsley, Bureau of Reclamation	Mike Hollis, MWD of Southern CA
Roberta Borgonovo, CA League of Women Voters	

Facilitation team members present included CALFED WUE Program Manager Tom Gohring, Hilda Smith (WUE Program Analyst), David Mitchell (M. Cubed), Lee Axelrad (Resources Law Group), and Bennett Brooks and Eric Poncelet (both of CONCUR, Inc.).

Other attendees included Adrienne Alvord (Legislative Director, Speaker Pro Tem Christine Kehoe), Manucher Alemi (DWR) and Mark Roberson (CALFED consultant).

II. Meeting Materials

The following meeting materials were provided in advance of or at the meeting (meeting materials are available on CALFED's website):

- Agenda and Discussion Notes
- Revised Ground Rules
- Revised Purpose/Scoping Statement
- Draft Matrix - Elements of an Urban Water Use Measurement Framework
- Revised Roster -- Urban Water Use Measurement Staff Work Group

III. Key Outcomes

A. Updates:

Urban Water Use Measurement Drafting Teams: A Drafting Team teleconference was held on March 28, 2003. Work Group members on the call included Lucille Billingsley, Betsy Reifsnider, Chris Dundon, Luis Generoso, Dick Bennett, Mike Hollis, Fran Spivy-Weber, Tom Gohring, David Mitchell, Bennett Brooks, and Eric Poncelet. The Drafting Team addressed issues concerning ground rules, stakeholder representation in the Work Group, and the Work Group's purpose and scope.

Staff Work Group Representation: Two Work Group members are declining to participate in the Work Group: Valerie Nera (California Chamber of Commerce), and Chris Dundon (Contra Costa Water District). Both cited time constraints limiting their ability to participate fully. CALFED staff, in an effort to increase Work Group representation from the Central Valley, has invited the City of Modesto (Water Department) to participate. City of Modesto representatives are expected to participate in the next meeting. CALFED staff are also attempting to find a business sector replacement for the California Chamber of Commerce.

Assembly Bill 306: Adrienne Alvord, Legislative Director for Assembly Speaker Pro Tem Christine Kehoe, provided an update on the objectives and progress of Assembly Bill 306 (Water Meters). She discussed recent amendments to the bill, such as deadline extensions and provisions for new water districts to come under the bill's jurisdiction. She noted that while the bill has garnered broad support to date, there has been some opposition by municipalities and water purveyors who say the legislation will result in implementation hardships. Work Group members asked a number of clarifying questions. Alvord requested additional input from the Work Group members, especially those representing Central Valley interests.

B. Purpose/Scoping Statement

Participants reviewed and commented on a new Purpose/Scoping Document that had been confirmed in the 3/28 Drafting Team meeting. The reviewed material incorporated the following key changes:

- *Work Group Objective:* The original version of the Purpose Statement discussed at the 3/18 Work Group kick-off meeting focused on the benefits that improved urban water use measurement might provide for water purveyors. Participants agreed to extend this objective to include the benefits that improved urban water use measurement would provide for state and federal water management efforts.
- *Work Group Focus:* The Work Group agreed to delay addressing issues pertaining to service metering and volumetric pricing until the outcomes of the AB 306 legislative process become more clear. Participants also recommended that all references to "metering" in the purpose statement be changed to "measurement" to reflect the broader focus of the Work Group.

A final version of the revised Purpose/Scoping Statement will be distributed to all Work Group members.

C. Matrix – Elements of an Urban Water Use Measurement Framework

CALFED staff presented a preliminary matrix containing the elements of an Urban Water Use Measurement framework to the Work Group for review and comment. Work Group members commented generally on all the sections of the matrix but focused their attention on refining the “concerns” expressed in Items 3 and 4. CALFED staff asked Work Group members to confirm that the concerns listed in the matrix were articulated appropriately and completely and to state their priorities as to which concerns are most important. Participants touched on some of the possible options/solutions presented, but these issues were not addressed in detail.

Participants expressed some confusion over the terminology used in the matrix. CALFED staff committed to produce a glossary of terms prior to the next Work Group meeting.

Below is a summary of key discussion points for Items 3 and 4.

Item 3: Concern over the effect of the current system of collecting water extraction, delivery, end use, and return flow data on the ability of water suppliers to contribute to, and of governmental agencies to meet, state/federal water management objectives related to planning, allocation, transfers, and water use efficiency.

Concerns:

- *End use data collection:* Participants noted the importance of adding end use consumption data (in the form of aggregated statistical profiles) to the list of data needs. End use consumption refers to the application of water to its final purpose by the customer of a water system. Within the household, this applies to such specific uses of water as toilet water use or laundry water use.
- *Data collection format standardization:* Participants commented on the lack of coordination and standardization among state/federal agencies regarding the format in which data is collected. This is due to the existence of multiple purposes being served by the data (e.g., operations data, strategic/analytic data).
- *Potential benefits of improved urban water use data collection:* Work Group members discussed a variety of additional benefits that would stem from improved urban water use data collection. Examples include:
 - Facilitate BMP implementation and certification.
 - Determine cost-effectiveness of different water conservation measures
 - Establish rationales for federal and state grant/loan funding decisions

- Ease burdens placed on water suppliers by multiple and uncoordinated approaches to state/federal data collection (e.g., multiple data forms and categories)
- Determine system/basin losses
- Quantify water transfers, both urban to agriculture and agriculture to urban
- Establish where conservation is occurring in relation to particular sources of water supply

Possible options/solutions:

The Work Group did not discuss in detail possible options/solutions. This topic is to be further engaged at a subsequent Drafting Team meeting.

Implementation considerations:

- *Confidentiality issues:* Participants discussed the importance of balancing the need for urban water end use data (i.e., for different end uses within households) with the need for confidentiality of individual household users. Participants agreed that this type of data is most valuable when aggregated across households and did not think that this posed confidentiality concerns.
- *Funding constraints:* Participants described funding constraints as impacting urban water use measurement data collection at all levels.
- *Technological barriers:* Participants noted that data collection efforts will always be hampered by imperfect measurement technologies.

Item 4. Concern over the degree to which newer technologies, devices, and approaches (e.g., sub-metering, landscape metering and aerial surveys, wastewater and recycled water metering) should be adopted to assist water supplier implementation of actions that support state/federal agency implementation of water management objectives related to planning, allocation, transfers, and water use efficiency.

Concerns:

- *Accuracy standards:* Participant discussed the need establish and validate accuracy standards for newer technologies. Regulatory inconsistencies also need to be addressed (e.g., weights & measures gaps in testing of hot water meters).
- *Customer resistance:* Water supplier participants noted that their efforts to implement new measurement methods will likely face customer resistance in certain instances (e.g., regarding use of landscape meters).

- Work group members also added further definition to this concern. In particular, they discussed several new technologies that would improve current measurement of urban water use (example: service-meter-reading software that correlates consumption to specific end uses and durations).

Possible options/solutions:

The Work Group did not discuss the proposed options/solutions in any detail. Further discussion on this matter and on the other proposed options/solutions is slated for a subsequent Drafting Team meeting. Several key discussion points include the following.

- *Standards for sub-meters:* Participants called for greater accuracy standards for sub-meters.
- *Seed research data:* Participants noted the need for research to true-up emerging technologies.
- *Subsidization of urban water use measurement retrofits:* A few comments were made on the pros and cons of subsidizing urban water use measurement retrofits. Discussion centered, in particular, on the equity issues involved vis-à-vis different water suppliers and the need for and value of subsidies for lower-income communities.

Implementation considerations:

- *Links between water and wastewater measurement:* Participants discussed the linkages that exists between water supply and wastewater treatment agencies. In particular, several participants noted possible inequities arising from the fact that wastewater treatment agencies may benefit as “free riders” from water supplier investments in water use efficiency. This was described as an implementation consideration for all water use efficiency measures.
- *Rate relief:* Participants discussed the need for possible short-term rate relief in cases where WUE measures result in water supplier decreases in revenues.
- *Low income communities:* Participants discussed the need for some form of financial assistance to assist low-income communities improve their urban water use measurement.

IV. Next Steps

A. Future Meeting Schedule

Participants agreed to the following meeting schedule.

<u>Date</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Meeting Type</u>	<u>Location</u>
Wednesday, April 23	3:00 –3:45 PM	Drafting Team	Teleconference
Wednesday, April 30	12:45–4:00 PM	Full Work Group	In person, Sacramento
Tuesday, May 20	12:30–4:00 PM	Full Work Group	In person, Sacramento

Information on specific locations, agendas and teleconference call-in numbers will be distributed at a later date. Additional meetings are also likely to be scheduled.

B. April 23, 2003 Drafting Team Meeting

Participants agreed to hold a drafting team meeting – via teleconference – on Wednesday, April 23, from 3:00 – 3:45 PM to follow up on the discussions of the April 7, 2003 full Work Group meeting.

C. Documents to be revised and produced:

For the next full Work Group meeting, CALFED Program Staff is to provide revisions to the following documents:

- Purpose/Scope Statement
- Framework Matrix
- Glossary of applicable terms